DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 243 493 IR 050 719

| | |
|---|---|
| TITLE | Collection Analysis Project. The University of Michigan. Executive Summary. |
| INSTITUTION | Michigan Univ., Ann Arbor. Univ. Libraries. |
| SPONS AGENCY | Association of Research Libraries, Washington, D.C. Office of Management Studies. |
| PUB DATE | May 83 |
| NOTE | 23p. |
| PUB TYPE | Viewpoints (120) -- Reports - Descriptive (141) |
| EDRS PRICE | MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS. |
| DESCRIPTORS | Budgeting; *College Libraries; Information Science; *Library Acquisition; *Library Collections; Library Cooperation; *Library Expenditures; Library Material Selection; Preservation; Research Libraries; *Shared Services |
| IDENTIFIERS | *Collection Assessment; Resource Sharing; *University of Michigan |

ABSTRACT

This paper summarizes the most pressing issues arising from a collection analysis project (CAP) initiated at the University of Michigan in the summer of 1981, and briefly describes options available for resolving these issues. It is noted that the CAP followed a model developed by the Association of Research Libraries (ARL). Topics covered include: (1) university and library finances; (2) the budget allocation process, including documentation, formula allocation, and unit fund allocation; (3) library material selection, including issues related to appointments, training, standards and evaluation, and the organization of selection among the graduate library, divisional libraries, and the Office of Collection Development; (4) collection assessment; (5) preservation, including organizational, educational, environmental, security, and budgetary concerns; (6) resource sharing attitudes and program performance elements which include bibliographic access, document delivery, regional cooperation, and costs; (7) the definition of collection levels and work on the Research Libraries Group (RLG) Conspectus; and (8) the impact of new technologies on the library's role, equipment, personnel, budget allocations, user fees, and resource sharing. (ESR)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

ED243493

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

# EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

## COLLECTION ANALYSIS PROJECT

## THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

May 1983

Mona East, Co-Chair
Patricia Yocum, Co-chair

John Eilts
Jean Loup
Constance McGuire
David Norden
Diane Schwartz
Jack Weigel

IR050719

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Maxine Sitts

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Table of Contents


| | |
|---|---|
| Introduction | 1 |
| FINANCES | 2 |
| ALLOCATION PROCESS | 4 |
| SELECTION | 6 |
| ASSESSMENT | 10 |
| PRESERVATION | 11 |
| RESOURCE SHARING | 13 |
| DEFINING COLLECTION LEVELS | 16 |
| NEW TECHNOLOGIES | 17 |
| Conclusion | 20 |

# INTRODUCTION

The Collection Analysis Project (CAP) was initiated in the summer of 1981 according to the model developed by the Office of Management Studies, Association of Research Libraries. The project has consisted of three phases. The first was collectively presented as the Interim Report. It included a "History of the Library"; "Values of the Library"; and a paper by Dr. Richard M. Dougherty, "Maintaining the Library's Excellence: When the Past Will Not be Prologue" (Jan. 1982). In the second phase the following task forces were appointed: Allocation; Organization of Selection; Assessment; Preservation; and Resource Sharing as per the CAP model. A sixth task force, New Needs and Possibilities, was created locally to address technological changes and their effects on libraries. Each task force was charged to study aspects of its topic and to produce a final report.

The Executive Summary constitutes the third phase of the project. Its purpose is to note the most prominent themes which emerged in the earlier phases, to summarize the most pressing issues, and, where possible, to note options available for resolving them. Necessarily, the Executive Summary cannot address all issues facing the Library or discuss them in the detail that they warrant. To a great extent, that discussion has been provided in the Interim Report and in the Task Force reports, which should be consulted for a fuller understanding. Furthermore, although CAP is an advisory study for the Director, we hope that it will stimulate discussion throughout the Library. In short, we see CAP as a dynamic rather than a static project, a report which shows relationships in a new light, and a process which fosters reflection, discussion and change.

For the Study Team, CAP has been a long and stimulating assignment through which we have learned much. Most importantly, we have renewed our sense of the centrality of the Library collection to the University and the present key role of the librarian in the development of that collection. Both, we believe, need to be re-affirmed regularly. We urge the Library Administration to lead that re-affirmation and the staff to echo it. Ultimately, we look forward to incorporating the issues addressed by CAP into the Planning Process because they are of permanent concern and merit prominent attention.

May 1983

Mona East, Co-Chair
Patricia Yocum, Co-Chair

John Eilts
Jean Loup
Constance McGuire
David Norden
Diane Schwartz
Jack Weigel

## FINANCES

Few would dispute that higher education currently faces serious financial challenge. The seeming wealth of the recent past has given way to relatively constricted resources at a time when large new needs are surfacing. Because prospects for significant economic improvement are slim, competition for resources between units and by activities within units will become more intense over the next two decades.

In these respects the Library is like the University. Through the year 2000 Library activities will continue to center on conventional printed material. At the same time new forms of information will appear with increased frequency. Chief among these will be automated data bases, electronic publishing and video-discs, which will not replace printed materials entirely but will often serve as alternatives to them. Pressure for large increases in the University allocation to the Library materials budget will persist as will pressure for internal redistribution of that budget. Both pressures will be affected by program development and reduction in the University; cooperative arrangements such as the Research Libraries Group (RLG); continuing increases in the cost of materials; the number of publications of interest to scholars; and new forms of publication.

Issues

1. THE UNIVERSITY. In the next two decades the principal challenge facing the University is to provide sufficient funding to meet both old and new needs. The uncertainty of individual and aggregate costs of the new forms of information complicates the situation. It is always possible, of course, to assume a "wait and see" posture. Most likely, though, the University will not escape spending money on the new forms, and a passive approach involves considerable risks. These include the proliferation of service centers formally or informally established to meet the demand, duplication of effort and expense, lack of coordination and consequent development of incompatible systems, and gaps in the overall fabric. This is not to say that all new forms should be provided only by the Library. That is neither possible nor desirable. It is clear, though, that through its long experience in collecting and organizing large masses of information resources and making them available to users, the Library is a prime unit in which to concentrate many of the new forms. Hence, there is a need to decide as far in advance as possible what new forms the Library should provide, the extent to which it will provide these, and the relationship between the Library and other campus units involved in similar activities. Financing these activities involves important and difficult decisions. For the Library, the worst case situation would involve responsibility to provide the new forms in addition to conventional forms with no increase in allocation. Under these conditions the Library would be hard-pressed to fulfill either responsibility. The best situation would see the Library given the financies to meet both

responsibilities intelligently, rationally and with some room to experiment. The challenge then would be to achieve a balanced mix between the old and the new with neither part dominating the Library's efforts or finances.

2. THE LIBRARY. On its part, the Library will increasingly generate a portion of its funding. This is already apparent in the number and size of grants which it has received over the past four years. Efforts to secure additional grants will continue and involve more librarians at all levels of the organization. At the same time the Library would do well to consider the appointment of a development officer to nurture gift-giving. Although it has some endowments, the Library could augment these if it took a sustained, active role in development. Both grant-getting and gift-solicitation rely on knowledge of what external financial sources are available and which Library needs are most prominent. It is the Library's task to match source and need appropriately, to be mindful of the impact special projects can have on routine operations and to avoid financing basic functions with "soft" money.

## ALLOCATION PROCESS

Available records indicate that Library book funds have long been distributed on the principle best described as "historic-pragmatic". Accordingly, previous allocations are accepted as precedents, but modifications are made to accommodate changing emphases and new needs. The allocation process is complex and involves Library staff at many levels during the course of the year. It begins with formal statements of need prepared by fund managers. The Assistant Director for Collection Development reviews these along with accounting reports and special reports prepared by Acquisitions and Serials. In addition, the Assistant Director consults materials price indices, exchange rates and the University's course offerings. She then prepares a detailed draft budget request and submits it to the Director, who, in turn, incorporates it into his annual request for the full Library budget. Both the Provost and Vice-President for Academic Affairs and the Budget Priorities Committee review the request. Later in the year the University Administration decides on the Library's funds. A set of book fund allocations is drafted, harmonized with original budget requests, reviewed and adopted.

### Issues

1. DOCUMENTATION. Rational development of the collection requires an understanding of the basis on which support is given. Although Library practices have increasingly reflected the trend toward wider distribution of budget information, more systematic documentation of the allocation principle and allocation process is needed. Guidelines for preparing written budget requests should be consistent throughout the Library. Fund managers need to receive and provide more clear, pertinent data. Finally, there should be a more formal mechanism for responding to budget requests during or immediately after the review process, including an explanation of the basis for specific allocation decisions.

2. FORMULA. Use of a formula could validate the results of the application of the "historic-pragmatic" principle. Data elements could include the number of academic programs and level of degrees offered, number of primary library users, and quantity and average cost of publications. In the past collection and manipulation of such data was laborious but present computing capabilities mitigate these disadvantages. By itself a formula is an inadequate mechanism for making decisions because it excludes non-quantifiable factors and precludes informed judgment. Therefore, if used, a formula should supplement and not supplant the present principle of allocation.

3. UNIT FUNDS. The delegation of fiscal responsibility to fund managers over the last decade has worked well. It promotes accountability and coordination of selection policy with fund alloction. It also keeps decision-making close to the librarians who know user needs and the literature. The increased information proposed above will allow continued distribution of this responsibility while permitting the Library Administration to monitor use of funds.

## SELECTION

Development of the collection is one of the chief responsibilities of the Library. Until recently, the faculty played a major role in selecting new titles, but the main responsibility now resides with more than fifty selectors. Together, faculty and staff efforts have been effective in developing wide-ranging collections with many areas of depth and excellence which support scholarly inquiry.

The role of librarian as chief selector throughout the system is a relatively recent phenomenon. It appeared at the same time that other matters were demanding more attention. Because it is complex and varied, selection may not have received the full study and analysis which it needs. Thus, though structured, the selection process is not always organized to maximum effectiveness; in some cases coordination is loose; and adequate time in not always available to attend to the needs of the collection. Similarly, what may have been understood about the selection process when it was centralized may not be widely known now. Working independently and with different approaches, both the Organization and Assessment Task Forces concluded that U of M librarians hold their role as selector in very high regard. They wish to give priority to collection development, want to be effective, and wish to improve the processes by which the collection grows and changes.

Issues

1. APPOINTMENTS. Effective selection begins with the appointment of the selector. To encourage the best match of personnel and duties, selection assignments should be made as carefully as other positions. They should be clearly delineated, should indicate the amount of time normally required, and should be open to all librarians. Vacancies should be posted and interested librarians would apply for the position. Choice of a selector should be based on the individual's expertise weighed against the needs of the collection and other requirements of the job. For successful applicants, formal selection assignments would be made part of their job descriptions. Because adequate time to fulfill selection responsibilities is essential, it might be necessary in some cases to reduce other obligations. This should be done formally and the operating unit compensated where necessary to retain its full operating capacity. It is assumed that negotiation among the selector, supervisor and other involved parties might be common.

2. TRAINING. Although most librarians study the principles of collection development in graduate school, selecting for a specific collection mandates on-the-job training. U of M librarians perceive the need to expand and formalize the training they presently receive. The program which the Study Team envisions would include two phases. Initial training would involve every selector at the beginning of selection work.

It would be uniform, emphasize the totality of the collection and include an introduction to the overall policies, methods, and assumptions used to develop the collection. It would also include detailed introduction to collection strengths and proposed collecting levels of the specific assignment. Continuing training, the second phase, is largely the responsibility of the individual selector but should be supplemented by regular meetings. These should include meetings with other selectors in the same unit and/or subject area, and in monthly or quarterly meetings open to all. The latter would have topical emphases, function as seminars and encourage formal presentations. The Organization Task Force and Assessment Task Force Reports offer a number of techniques which can be used for each type of training and record the current use of many of them.

3. STANDARDS AND EVALUATION. Selection is complex and ultimately relies on individual judgment. Developing standards for performance is therefore difficult but must be attempted if selectors are to understand the Library's expectations of their work. The recent introduction of goal-based performance evaluation offers one framework for development and implementation. It is clear, though, that no one standard or measure of performance can adequately indicate quality of selection. Rather, a combination of criteria applied over a long period of time will be necessary and should be developed for all librarians who have selection responsibilities.

4. ORGANIZATION. Organization is not an end in itself but rather a means which an institution uses to achieve its goals. The organization of selection, then, needs to support collection development as a principal responsibility of the Library. In many units this is currently the case. The situation is complicated, though, by the fact that selectors report administratively to the Associate Director for Public Services or the Associate Director for Technical Services. Their selection work, however, is central to the concerns of the Assistant Director for Collection Development. Given the size of the Library and in light of the complications which a different structure might have, this is a preferred arrangement. Nonetheless, improvements based on a central concept could be made.

Graduate Library

The Organization Task Force Report indicates dissatisfaction among Graduate Library selectors regarding the organization of selection in that unit. Concern focuses on how well the organization assures the quality of the collection and fulfills user needs. In response, the Task Force has recommended one type of reorganization. The Study Team concurs with the subject division approach for English language materials but suggests that, instead of a corps of collection specialists, selection assignments should be distributed widely to approximately the same number of selectors as is currently active. Each selector would have responsibility for at least one subject (e.g. American literature; economics; public policy) and would select both monographs and serials in that area. Faculty and other user requests would be forwarded to the appropriate

selector for decison. In addition the selector would have primary responsibility for deselection, storage, preservation, and approval plan decisions in his/her subject area.

Division of responsibility along subject lines would ensure coverage for areas in which GL collects, foster consistency and provide more accountability for selection decisions. It would provide greater flexibility for modifying collecting scope and level and at the same time foster development of subject expertise. By providing more opportunity for faculty contact, it would increase selectors' knowledge of developing scholarly interests. Finally, a subject approach would provide more visibility for the GL selectors and collection.

## Divisional Libraries

The most structured organization exists within the divisional library where selection duties are integrated into jobs and reporting lines are clear. As separate units, divisional libraries generally operate independently of each other regarding the content and quality of their collections. However, divisional librarians occasionally consult among themselves and with the staff of the Graduate Library.

## Coordination

The Library collection is a large resource enriched by individual decisions made throughout the system. At the same time, there is risk of inconsistency, omission or inadvertent overlap in selection decisions. To avoid this, selectors should act in a concerted way and select knowledgeably with the whole collection in mind. Coordination, then, is an intrinsic and significant part of the selection process. It may be achieved through individual consultation with patrons or other librarians. In the larger libraries, such as the Graduate Library and the Taubman Medical Library, more formal arrangements are probably necessary. The latter can involve a permanent position as selection coordinator or a temporary assignment which rotates among a group of selectors.

## Office of Collection Development

The existence of the position of Assistant Director for Collection Development unequivocally states the importance with which the Library views the collection. As a staff position, the Assistant Director maintains an overview of the collection's development, plans for future general development, maintains contact with fund managers, prepares recommended fund allocations judged on relative needs, and represents the Library in national forums. There is no "line" authority over selectors but the position has a powerful voice in fund allocations. Librarians trust the present Assistant Director to apply the "historic-pragmatic" principle of allocation fairly. However, there is currently no provision to preserve the institutional wisdom which M. East has developed since her appointment as Selection Officer in 1955.

Of equal importance are the implications of increased demands on this position in the future. In addition to the present activities of the Assistant Director, the Study Team sees Collection Development with the following duties:

1. In conjunction with the line supervisors, coordinate selector activities with respect to selection positions, appointments, in-service training, and evaluation.

2. Maintain contact with selection coordinators.

3. In concert with appropriate librarians, develop, document and communicate collection development policies for the system and coordinate efforts to set collecting priorities.

4. Compile and disseminate statistical information needed for budget requests, allocations and collecting intensity.

5. Keep current with changes in academic programs and faculty appointments; assess effects on the Library and initiate appropriate adjustments.

6. Maintain local version of the Conspectus and coordinate refinements to it.

7. Initiate and/or coordinate assessment studies; compile and disseminate results.

8. In collaboration with selectors and unit heads, prepare grant proposals for collection improvement.

9. Plan for future programs and needs.

Further functions might be added and could include those suggested in the Organization Task Force Report. Clearly, additional staff will be needed and should include clerical support and an additional librarian with substantial experience in collection development.

## ASSESSMENT

Assessment offers a systematic way to measure the quality of the collection. Evaluation of that quality has long been a prime interest of the Library staff and served as an impetus for staff recommendations that CAP be undertaken. Early in the project, however, it was apparent that a comprehensive evaluation of the collection was not possible during the relatively short study period. At the same time, continuing work on the RLG Conspectus made duplicate effort questionable. In addition, the Assessment Task Force increasingly questioned the underlying precepts and traditional methodologies of collection evaluation. The Task Force came to view assessment as a tool for measuring past selection activities whereas they believed control of future quality lay in current selection. At this point in the development of selection skills, they reasoned, assessment should emphasize improvement of current selection rather than judgement of past decisions. Thus, the Pre-Assessment Model encourages establishment of mechanisms to evaluate current selector performance to redress any shortcomings.

### Issues

1. ASSESSMENT STUDIES. Of the assessment studies which have recently been conducted in the Library, those considered most valuable shared common characteristics. They were well-defined, studied discrete factors, used suitable methodologies, and were feasible to undertake with available resources. As a tool for a specific purpose, assessment studies can be useful. They require careful construction and objective interpretation of results. Although most past studies were done manually, new technologies offer greater efficiency and timeliness at lower cost. In addition to selector performance, potential study topics include the needs of preservation; effectiveness of gift and exchange agreements; impact of resource sharing; storage arrangements; and collection use. Assessment may also support academic program review and appraisal of Library strength relative to proposed programs and potential faculty appointments before decisions are finalized.

## PRESERVATION

Preserving and conserving its materials is an appropriate, important and continuing responsibility of the Library. This was formally recognized in the 1977 report prepared by the Working Group: University Library Conservation Program. In 1982 CAP reviewed developments of the intervening five years. Results demonstrate the ability of the Library and the University to identify problems in this area, to marshall resources, and to make substantial progress toward improving the situation. The Preservation Program is now in its second year, a Preservation Officer has been appointed and various program activities initiated. It is evident, then, that the U of M values preservation and offers long-term commitment to it.

It is also apparent that the need to preserve materials often runs counter to other considerations, in particular use of the collection and constraints on operations. For example, fragile material may suffer from handling but handling is required if the material is to be used. Similarly, although the benefits of shelving most books upright are commonly recognized, lack of sufficient shelving space may dictate other arrangements. Such conflict is a daily occurrence and suggests that compromise is inherent in the preservation process. Thus, the Library's task is to integrate preservation into the continuum of its operations which involve acquiring, organizing, recording and maintaining information and making it available to users.

### Issues

1. ORGANIZATION. The Preservation Office is presently part of the Technical Services Division. In terms of its coordinating function across the Library system, Preservation accomplishes its goals largely through influence, education, persuasion and performance rather than through hierarchical authority. In these respects the Preservation Office is more akin to Collection Development than to either Technical Services or Public Services. Therefore, the Study Team believes that the Preservation Office would find a more natural home if it reported to the Assistant Director for Collection Development. This placement would integrate preservation activities into selection and collection development and would promote understanding of preservation goals relative to other needs.

2. EDUCATION. Although sympathetic to the concept of preservation, many of us are inured to practices which damage material. Because changing our behavior first requires awareness of harmful practices, the Study Team believes that education must be a foremost goal of the Preservation Program. Some effort in this regard has already begun, most notably on the matter of food and drink in the Library. However, more activity in the immediate future is required. If the Library defers development and

implementation of a system-wide preservation education program, it risks further deterioration of the collection beyond the capacity of the Preservation Office to restore.

3. ENVIRONMENT. Materials should be provided with proper heat, humidity and light, housed in clean surroundings and cleaned periodically. Correcting a faulty environment and providing adequate custodial services is probably less expensive, in the long run,than is restoring damaged material. Currently, there are many areas in the Library system which lack adequate environmental controls and housekeeping services. For these areas corrective measures are clearly in order.

4. COLLECTION SECURITY. Library collections are always vulnerable to theft and mutilation. Although no security system can provide complete protection, it is possible to reduce risks. The recent rise in library crime is alarming and signals the need for immediate attention to this problem at the U of M, particularly in those areas where little security is presently available.

5. BUDGET. Costs of routine preservation functions, such as commercial binding, constitute the first charge on the General Fund book budget before allocations are made to unit funds. The amount of the charge is limited and has recently hovered around 8% of total book funds. To date, grants for special projects have augmented preservation funding but cannot be regarded as a permanent source. Yet the need for preservation and conservation is enormous and the inherent budgetary conflict between them and other activities is great. Difficult choices will be common and will involve many people. During the initial years of the Preservation Program, the Library must first determine what the size of the preservation budget should be relative to other needs and how that money should be generated. For this period the budget should be held for general use based on the needs of all collections.

## RESOURCE SHARING

Comprehensive collecting in a variety of disciplines has long been a tenet of collection development at the U of M. No university library, however, can hope to own all items which users may want to consult. One way around these limitations is for libraries to share access to their holdings. Types of resource sharing vary from the informal, one-time occurrence to the programs of a consortium such as RLG whereby at least one library accepts responsibility to collect in a specific subject area which might otherwise be neglected. This does not mean that the other libraries may not collect in that area but rather that they can reduce their obligation to do so while still retaining access to material if it is needed.

U of M librarians accept resource sharing in principle but recognize that there are problems which impede its success. These include a conflict between the drive to be comprehensive and the need to accept limitations; the uncertain impact of limited collections on local scholarship; and the practical difficulties involved in moving information between places which are geographically separated. Library users, especially the faculty, may be beset by the same doubts. Because resource sharing is an integral part of the modern research library, these concerns need to be addressed squarely.

Issues

1. ATTITUDE. The absence of enthusiastic support for resource sharing stems, in part, from lack of a clear understanding of what it is and what consequences it will have. There is concern that formal commitments in cooperative collection development will preempt local flexibility and limit scholarly inquiry, and that commitments to collect and share material will not be honored to their fullest. Changing campus attitudes toward resource sharing will not be easy. The University and Library Administrations have begun this effort by identifying the need, endorsing the goals of resource sharing, and committing the University to several programs. Within the Library more attention must be given to changing staff attitudes. It is also important that the Library and the University initiate vigorous discussions with the faculty. Finally, the Study Team believes that ultimate acceptance of resource sharing will depend upon the quality of program performance. If resource sharing meets basic criteria as outlined in the Resource Sharing Task Force Report, and, in particular, if its advantages accrue to all, it will more likely be accepted as an alternative to ownership.

2. PROGRAM PERFORMANCE. Key elements in successful program performance include the following.

Bibliographic Access.

The process of sharing resources starts with reliable access to the bibliographic record. Expected increases in borrowing and lending transactions and greater reliance on computers will increase the importance of this initial step. Thus, cooperative cataloging which produces machine-readable records is indispensable. It is therefore alarming to note the development nationwide of backlogs of uncataloged material whose sole record is retained only in local systems. If only for the needs of resource sharing, this situation must be redressed. Locally, this may require increased resources for and greater efficiency in cataloging. Nationally, a concerted effort to coordinate original cataloging activities would be appropriate and could be modelled on the principles underlying cooperative collection development.

Document Delivery

Present interlibrary lending systems generally provide reliable but relatively slow document delivery. New technology which transfers information electronically may provide a breakthrough in speed but is unlikely to be the sole or most economical means of delivery. It seems most probable that a mixture of both old and new methods will characterize the mechanics of resource sharing in the future. For either method the immediate task for the Library is to develop standards of performance based on user needs and then to adjust operations accordingly. Recent experience in establishing the Buhr storage facility can serve the Library as a model in this regard.

Regional Programs

Geographic proximity of similar institutions provides natural opportunity for resource sharing. The U of M is fortunate in being within an hour's drive of Michigan State University and Wayne State University, yet there is common perception that resource sharing among the three institutions has not been exploited to its fullest. Areas where further activity would be appropriate and profitable include provision of daily shuttle service Monday through Friday between Ann Arbor and East Lansing, and formal coordination of serials review and cancellation at all three universities. Increased activity with MSU and WSU does not mean a lessening of U of M's RLG commitments. Instead, it is a recognition that no single arrangement can fulfill all user needs any more than one library collection can. Thus, as access to material becomes a widely accepted alternative to ownership, the Library will need various resource sharing arrangements to satisfy demand.

Costs

It is generallly assumed that present U of M costs fall within acceptable limits. There is little comprehensive information, however, to substantiate this. Likewise, actual costs of well-run programs are unclear. It is advisable, therefore, that the Library initiate a study to determine present U of M costs of inter-institutional borrowing and lending.

Factors should include cost of staff time, equipment, records maintenance, and shipping for all units involved. This study would establish a baseline for current costs against which future costs could be measured. It might also help determine the economic limitations of resource sharing, that is, the point at which it once again becomes less expensive to buy the material rather than borrow it.

## DEFINING COLLECTION LEVELS

From virtually every point of analysis in the CAP Study, the need to define the level of collection strength has become self-evident. Understanding what subjects have been collected in the past, and to what extent, is critical to fund allocation, the selection process and resou[illegible] sharing obligations. The RLG Conspectus currently under development could [illegible]ve as a basis for definition. The Conspectus is an attempt to collate information about collection development policies of RLG member institutions as evidenced by existing collection strength and current collecting intensity. Whereas a shelflist measurement indicates quantity, the Conspectus attempts to signify quality as well. Development of the Conspectus has been slow but steady and represents substantial effort on the part of various librarians to prepare U of M's contribution.

Issues

1. CONSPECTUS. The benefits of development work on the Conspectus should be shared widely within the Library. Therefore, the Study Team recommends that U of M's Conspectus records be down-loaded into the forthcoming Integrated Library System (ILS) where local refinements could be made. These could include collecting levels of each campus library on each subject; name of current selector; principal academic programs served; average cost of materials; results of assessment studies; and cooperative collection development commitments if any. The information would be readily accessible for local use at reasonable cost and would have particular benefits for selection and the coordination of selection decisions.

## NEW TECHNOLOGIES

Rapidly developing technologies present the Library with new possibilities, needs and problems in the transfer of information and are causing a re-examination of the library's role in the academic environment. Some futurists predict that in our lifetime libraries, as we know them, will cease to exist and will be replaced by direct producer-user contact. In its report the New Needs and Possibilities Task Force confirms that libraries will undoubtedly change but in a gradual rather than precipitous way. The transition will involve continued significant acquisition of conventional printed material augmented by acquisition of new forms. The rate at which the latter appear and are accepted by users will vary among and even within disciplines. Because the new technologies are themselves subject to change, regular review of their value and appropriateness will be necessary.

The Task Force also noted that new developments in technology have begun to affect collection development at the U of M. In essence the transition has already begun here. With it comes a host of issues, some of which are addressed below.

Issues

1. THE LIBRARY. One purpose of a university library is to hold in common material which is needed by a body of scholars. This has not precluded scholars from owning their own material or consulting other material outside the library collection. Much the same will be true in the future. Regardless of published format, the Library will continue to provide the University with public access to information. To do this the Library must take an active role, assessing the situation, determining needs and preparing the environment. It will need to promote a redefinition of Library centrality to include the notion that the Library is a center for information management and services as well as for the collection.

2. EQUIPMENT. New technologies are machine-intensive and consequently will put enormous pressure on funding sources. Equipment alone will constitute a great expense. To this must be added the costs of adapting the physical plants to host new communication lines and providing sufficient user space often where it is already in short supply. To conserve expenditures, there will be a tendency to defer provision of electronic equipment in some areas. Aware of the financial contraints, the Study Team is also concerned about the consequences such deferral has on information access. Like modern science, the electronic library will find it difficult to pursue its work if it lacks modern equipment. Thus, if the Library and the University are to avoid creating a two-tiered system of libraries, the cost of electronic equipment must be borne. It is essen-

tial, then, that timetables for installation of such systems as RLIN and GEAC and development of ILS be prepared and publicized.

3. THE LIBRARIAN. Because of their experience in acquiring, organizing, storing and retrieving information, librarians will have an expanded role in the future. They will have closer contact with the faculty, serve as specialized consultants, and need expertise in academic areas as well as handling information. The new forms will challenge librarians to strike a proper balance in collection development. Selectors will need to keep current with the latest developments and be able to judge the quality of new material. To provide users with exposure to the new forms, selectors will need to experiment with acquisitions and not fear the occasional mistake. New forms will also bring a greater need to analyze and plan, to learn use of equipment and systems, and to integrate them into operations. As educators, librarians will have a pivotal role in preparing students, faculty and staff to use the electronic library. Development of training devices will be essential but could consume a disproportionate amount of staff time. Therefore, shared development within the Library and among libraries, such as RLG members, should be encouraged.

4. ALLOCATIONS. The cost of new forms constitutes a legitimate use of University funds and presents a practical need to account for allocation and expenditure. A number of budgeting options are available and include separating costs according to ownership of or access to information. Because needs and patterns of use will vary, the budgeting option selected should show specifically the amount of money available and how it is expended.

5. USER FEES. Charging users for information retrieved from commercial data bases represents the first "fee for service" situation in the contemporary library. User fees is a troubling, complex issue. A practical accommodation is to adopt an operating principle which affords free retrieval of information that is unavailable through reasonable searching in printed formats and to charge modestly for all others. The situation becomes more problematic, however, when the Library declines to acquire a print version and relies on computer access instead. Inherent in this is an ethical risk of the Library monopolizing access to information which formerly could be obtained cost-free by the user on a self-serve basis. Furthermore, material published exclusively in electronic form is a growth field whose limits are presently unclear. If the Library is to be a center of information services, it is inadvisable to construct barriers to access, especially at the outset. In short the Study Team believes that the Library should offer access to these resources on the same terms that it currently provides access to printed material, that is, without charge.

6. RESOURCE SHARING. Present resource sharing programs are geared to conventional printed material. Copyright restricts duplication but the borrowing and lending of this material is not prohibited. Information provided via the new technologies, however, often comes with restrictions. For example, some videodiscs include license for use only on a specific machine. This condition has serious implication for cooperative collection development arrangements. Libraries which rely on each other to collect in certain subjects may find it impossible to share material if it comes only in the new forms and with restrictions on use. A related issue concerns preservation of material. Because publishers might retain only the recent edition, libraries may become electronic archives. In this situation consortia such as RLG may need to expand their role and become brokers between libraries and publishers.

## CONCLUSION

CAP issues are timely. Developing technologies and changes in information handling will clearly affect the Library's work over the next two decades. However, the broad goal of making information and resources available has not and will not change. Despite differences in format and conditions of access, the Library will remain central to the University. Faced with complex issues, the Library of the near future will need the best minds for its work. It will also require detailed planning, and flexibility and assertiveness on the part of librarians to construct solutions for community benefit.

The Library has already begun to prepare for that future. Data base searching, RLG, RLIN, GEAC, committee assignments, bibliographic instruction, training programs, and grant proposals are but a part of the preparation. The challenges in them and in others to come are formidable. But we have confidence in staff abilities and know the strength of staff commitment to the Library and the University. We hope that CAP confirms these conclusions and that as an instrument it will foster understanding and constructive change where it is needed.